

Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/444,819	KIKUCHI ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Steven H. Rao	2814	

All Participants:

(1) Steven H. Rao.

(2) Sam Borodach (38,388).

Status of Application: Non-Final after RCE

(3) _____.

(4) _____.

Date of Interview: 15 July 2004

Time: _____

Type of Interview:

- ☒ Telephonic
☐ Video Conference
☒ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☒ Applicant's representative)

Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☒ No
 If Yes, provide a brief description:

Part I.

Rejection(s) discussed:

Rejection stated in Final Action mailed 11/17/2003 and advisory action mailed on 05/07/04

Claims discussed:

1-4,8,9,10,17,19 and 22-24 (all pending claims)

Prior art documents discussed:

Kwon , Moslehi and Blanchard

Part II.

SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:

See Continuation Sheet

Part III.

- ☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.
☒ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.


 (Examiner/~~OPF~~ Signature)

(Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: It was pointed out to Mr. Borodach that the amendment filed 2/13/04 by only changing surrounding to below does not overcome the applied prior art of record and the Applicants' were given an opportunity to submit a Supplemental amendment to move the case forward. Mr. Borodach stated he will write to his client and get back no latter than Tuesday 07/20/04. Ex. Rao called Mr. Borodach on Tuesday 07/20/04 and was informed that Mr. Borodach had not heard from his clients and Ex. Rao should proceed on the basis of the amendment already filed.